DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 061 SO 017 078

AUTHOR Wallace, James M.
TITLE The Anti-intellectualism of the Intellectuals: Perspectives from Liberal Journalism.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anti Intellectualism; Content Analysis; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Humanistic Education; Periodicals; *Progressive Education; Student Centered Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Dewey (John); Hofstadter (Richard); Nation (Journal); New Republic (Journal)

ABSTRACT

An analysis of John Dewey's writing for liberal journals reveals Dewey's early and forceful efforts to refute anti-intellectual perversions of his theories. During the 1920's, the child-centered branch of the progressive education movement included some schools and individuals that expressed anti-intellectual positions. Richard Hofstadter in his 1963 book "Anti-intellectualism in American Life" assigned some of the responsibility for anti-intellectual education to John Dewey. Hofstadter's analysis, however, was based on Dewey's books only. Had Hofstadter also considered Dewey's journalistic writings, he might have seen more clearly that Dewey was not anti-intellectual. An examination of educational commentary in the "Nation" and the "New Republic" during the 1920's shows that the two leading journals, both with long-standing interests in educational matters, provided a forum for thoughtful dialogue on progressive education and its child-centered elements. And it demonstrates that John Dewey and others issued repeated warnings against the anti-intellectual variants of child-centered education. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James M. Wallace

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED268061

The Anti-intellectualism of the Intellectuals: Perspectives from Liberal Journalism

by

James M. Wallace

Clark College

SO017078

The Anti-intellectualism of the Intellectuals: Perspectives from Liberal Journalism

James M. Wallace

In a retrospective review with the charming title "The Eggheads and the Fatheads," Stephen J. Whitfield in 1978 noted that Richard Hofstadter's 1963 book Anti-intellectualism in American Life had "failed to ignite the controversy of his other big books or to send younger scholars into archives the master so sedulously avoided."[1] It would be unfair to criticize the master for avoiding some of the archives; Hofstadter assimilated and interpreted a vast array of material in researching and writing this Pulitzer Prize-winning book. But an examination of one segment of archival material may extend Hofstadter's analyses and help to balance his judgments concerning some American educators, particularly John Dewey.

Hofstadter defined anti-intellectualism as a "resentment and suspicion of the life of the mind and of those who are considered to represent it; and a disposition constantly to minimize the value of that life."[2] He surveyed the origins and effects of anti-intellectualism in religion, politics, business and education. In the longest section of the book, Hofstadter traced the depressing history of educational anti-intellectualism, with special attention to progressive education and its bastard offspring, life-adjustment education.

Other historians, both before and since 1963, have analyzed anti-intellectualism and its expression in schooling, particularly in progressive education. Hofstadter acknowledged his debt to Merle Curti and other scholars and drew

---

Mr. Wallace is Professor of Education at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon.

particularly on Lawrence Cremin's Transformation of the School (1961).[3] In that book, Cremin noted that some progressive educators used Freudian insights in such a way as to "shift the focus of the school almost entirely to non-intellectual, or indeed, anti-intellectual concerns."[4]

In a book published the year following Anti-intellectualism, Sol Cohen identified the Public Education Association of New York City - and particularly its little Red School House, under the guidance of Elizabeth Irwin - with anti-intellectual trends during the 1920's. He claimed that the P.E.A.'s concern over such problems as mental hygiene, delinquency, and non-promotion led it to "minimize courses of study, eliminate academic standards or set them at the lowest level, and educate the public school staff in the principles and precepts of mental hygiene." He indicated that before World War I, the P.E.A. took a generally social-reformist position on education; later, when it shifted to a more child-centered orientation, it became "no longer merely indifferent to the school's role in the training of intelligence, but hostile to it."[5]

More recently, Diane Ravitch, although acknowledging Dewey's "humane, pragmatic, open-minded approach" to education, reinforced the charges of earlier historians, stating that "progressive educators rejected . . . the belief that the primary purpose of the school was to improve intellectual functioning. . ."[6]

This is a persistent issue which is worthy of the continued attention of educators and historians. So it seems appropriate to turn back to Hofstadter, as the key figure in this historical issue, and see what the use of some different source material will suggest. In a chapter titled "The Child and the World," the author assessed John Dewey's responsibility for child-centered and life-adjustment education and their anti-intellectual elements. While recognizing that Dewey came increasingly to deplore the child-centered excesses of some of

his disciples, Hofstadter also maintained that Dewey's refusal to outline specific goals for education (other than "growth") led to confusion and that "the effect of Dewey's philosophy on the design of curricular systems was devastating." He added that:

> . . . Dewey did American education a major disservice by providing what appears to be authoritative sanction for that monotonous and suffocating rhetoric about 'democratic living' with which American educationists smother our discussions of the means and ends of education.

Hofstadter did not claim that Dewey was himself anti-intellectual; he was examining not the intent of Dewey's work, but its effect, and that was clearly anti-intellectual:

> Having once put the child so firmly at the center, having defined education as growth without end, Dewey had so weighted the discussion of educational goals that a quarter century of clarificatory statements did not avail to check the anti-intellectual perversions of the theory.7

In spite of the vigor of the above statements, Hofstadter's over-all treatment of Dewey was not unsympathetic. Dewey was seen not as the villain of the anti-progressive tracts of Max Rafferty and Hyman Rickover but as a minor tragic figure.[8] There was a tone of sorrow in Hofstadter's critique - sorrow that Dewey was not a thinker and writer of greater clarity and incisiveness. Had he been such, he might have been able to head off at an earlier date some of the misinterpretations and misapplications of his educational ideas and thus have saved the progressive education movement from the excesses which contributed to its downfall and continued bad repute.

In analyzing his role in progressive education, Hofstadter drew on eight of Dewey's books, ranging in time from My Pedagogic Creed (1897) to Experience and Education (1938). But, had Hofstadter also considered Dewey's journalistic

writings, and those of his major interpreters, he might have seen more clearly Dewey's early and forceful efforts to refute anti-intellectual perversions of his theories.

An examination of educational commentary in The Nation and The New Republic during the 1920's suggests a more complex picture than Hofstadter presented in his sweeping overview. It shows that the two leading liberal journals, both with long-standing interests in educational matters, provided a forum for thoughtful dialogue on progressive education and its child-centered elements. And it demonstrates that John Dewey, Boyd Bode, Joseph K. Hart and others issued repeated warnings against the anti-intellectual variants of child-centered education.

One irony to be noted in considering this material is that Dewey and the other thinkers who wrote for these journals were, by any reasonable standard, intellectuals. Thus we have, to the degree that these persons were, in fact, guilty as charged, what Christopher Lasch called the "anti-intellectualism of the intellectuals." Lasch's study, The New Radicalism in America, did not focus on educators as a group, but it did consider a number of people associated with the liberal journals (particularly The New Republic), including Dewey, Herbert Croly, Walter Lippmann, and Randolph Bourne. And Lasch concluded that at least some American intellectuals felt impelled to flee from what they saw as their own sterile, over-civilized intellectuality and sought the non-rational and the primitive in art, music, literature, politics and education.[9]

The Nation and The New Republic were supporters of progressive education, and gave considerable attention to (though not consistent editorial backing for) the child-centered elements of that movement. In view of continuing historical interest in anti-intellectualism, and the recurrent educational concern over

issues of excellence, the following questions are relevant: To what degree (if any) did the liberal journals provide a forum for anti-intellectual statements on education? Did the editors themselves take positions which provided aid and comfort to anti-intellectual forces? In short, did Lasch's "anti-intellectualism of the intellectuals" extend to the educational commentary carried by America's two leading liberal journals?

The first question is easily answered. In the pages of The Nation, then under the editorship of culturally conservative Oswald Villard, anti-intellectual statements on education are rarely found.[10] The New Republic, however, still under the leadership of founding editor Herbert Croly, was more culturally liberal and more attuned to new educational developments than was The Nation, and thus gave more space to proponents of the new psychology and its child-centered educational expression.[11] And amidst these child-centered statements were some, particularly those written by Elizabeth Irwin and her admirers, which were at least superficially anti-intellectual.

In a 1924 New Republic symposium on the elementary school, Miss Irwin wrote enthusiastically of the kind of schooling in which "the conception of education as being of the intellect soon fades into the background." She recognized, however, that such a statement raised an important question:

> If, then, the new school is to take this off-hand view of the intellectual life of the child, what is education all about? It is not primarily a process of imparting information; it is not first of all a method of teaching reading and writing and thereby ridding the country of illiteracy. It is to provide situations in which a child can experiment with life, can express himself creatively, can orient himself in his own world.12

Seven months earlier Agnes de Lima had passed on to New Republic readers the following startling statement of Miss Irwin's: "No child under eight should

be expected to form letters less than a foot high, and even then no high standard of perfection should be imposed." Mrs. de Lima added matter-of-factly that "the nerve strain is too severe."[13]

In 1924, Miss Irwin and Louis Marks published Fitting the School to the Child - an explanation and defense of their child-centered experiment in Public School 61. Agnes de Lima, in a sympathetic review of the book, quoted the authors' statement that:

> What education chiefly needs is that we shall take more for granted in regard to the child's intellectual development and take more thought about teaching him the art of happy and productive living.14

Miss Irwin herself made the point even more forcefully two years later in a plea that six-year-olds not be taught to read: "If I had my way I'd turn them all out with balls and bats, hoops and jumping ropes and let them be as illiterate as nature made them for at least another year ot two."

Miss Irwin's readers may have been even more startled by the statements that followed. She had noticed that:

> Bright children usually learn to read of themselves with very little help before they are eight, and the task of the modern school becomes one of luring them from this field into activity.

Such an approach brought anxious questions. Miss Irwin reported that she was often asked: "Do you prevent your children from learning to read when they want to?" Her reply was: "Not by main force do we prevent them, but if we can make reality more enticing and participation in active enterprises more interesting, we feel that we have succeeded better than if we leave them bent double over the Book of Knowledge."[15]

But statements such as these were rare in New Republic articles and reviews - and even more scarce in the editorials carried by that journal. Occasionally

in the heat of dispute with educational conservatives the editors would oppose a "return to the 'intellectual' standpoint of the older type" of education. Or they would express the opinion that in the high school the "field of choice should not be limited to so-called intellectual pursuits . . ." But the statement which followed may have evoked surprise from the journal's educated readers: ". . . nor should any prejudice be exerted in their favor."[16]

Statements such as those above, standing by themselves, certainly suggest that anti-intellectual views had penetrated the educational thinking of some New Republic writers and editors. But context is all-important here. A further look indicates that in most cases the writers believed that their newer approaches to education would eventually result in greater, rather than less, intellectual development.

Miss Irwin, for example, in her article on "Personal Education," followed her critical comments on intellectual education with a list of stages: "First of all a child functions physically, then emotionally, and then intellectually. In the traditional school this order is reversed and therefore the child does not function at all. He is educated in the passive voice." An organic education would fit in with the child's natural growth patterns and thus result in greater development in all areas:

> If the first few years of children's lives are devoted to self-initiated activity, to free use of their hands, their bodies, and their imaginations without much regard to what they learn or to the actual quality of what they make, it automatically happens that their standard of performance goes up. Their intellectual curiosity awakes and they themselves wish to be taught the techniques of the work they are doing and demand the information that the traditional school is so eager to give them. Such children learn to read because they want to; they learn to reason because they have to; they learn arithmetic because they need it.17

Mrs. de Lima, one of Miss Irwin's most enthusiastic interpreters, made the same point in "Education Moves Ahead," in which she reviewed Irwin's and Mark's Fitting the School to the Child along with other educational books. She asserted that

> Children who are 'let alone,' who are not forced into uncongenial tasks and held to them by the lash of the schoolmaster, or by his black marks, are learning as well if not better than those in the traditional school; they are acquiring not merely more general information and a vastly richer sense of the world, but they can read, write and do arithmetic in advance of their grade.

She cited evidence of this point from Ellsworth Collings' study of an experimental school in McDonald County, Missouri, which demonstrated that "children, under such a regime, acquire the 'common facts and skills' - the three R's - better than in the traditional school."[18]

This theme - that the new education not only provided for children's physical, emotional, and esthetic needs, but that it equalled or surpassed traditional schools in intellectual or academic development - appeared in numerous articles in the journals during the 1920's. Thus Miss Irwin asserted that if children exercise their "intelligence upon the problems of their miniature world," this will induce a "hunger for information and a thirst for intellectual adventure that will demand the aid of books." Lawrence Morris claimed that "by shoveling information into children, the traditional schools fill their heads with unrelated knowledge and deaden intelligence. Miss Pratt, [Director of the City and Country School] by assuming that childhood is a part of life instead of a preparation for it, awakens intelligence." Agnes de Lima's articles in the Nation asserted that in Miss Irwin's educational scheme "the three R's are adequately taken care of, though not in the ordinary stultifying

fashion." And Evelyn Dewey gave Nation readers the same assurance, noting that at the Children's School "the children keep ahead of the conventional school curriculum."[19]

Throughout these statements - to complicate an aphorism - is the belief that schools could have their academic bread and eat their child-centered cake too.[20] Or, as Alvin Johnson put it in reporting that the Walden School was able to surpass traditional academic standards: "The school is ready to pay Caesar in full the things that are Caesar's."[21] (This has the neat effect of casting the traditional school in the role of Caesar, thus assigning a more exalted status to the progressive schools). An important point in all this is that no writers stepped forward to defend a version of child-centered education which was unabashedly anti-intellectual. The various authors promoted an education in which schools could (to add yet another proverb) seek first the kingdom of childhood, freedom, and impulse with the blessed assurance that all else (achievement test scores and college admissions) would be added unto them.

Some writers for the journals would not let the child-centered enthusiasts off so easily. In 1929 Jean Temple, a former teacher at the Walden School, emphasized in her New Republic review of Rugg and Shumaker's The Child-Centered School the authors' critique of the lack of intellectual discipline in the new schools: They "feel that the experimental school fails to train in critical intelligence, in those estimates, appreciations, and generalizations which are essential to either understanding or direction of the problem presented by modern culture."[22]

A year later The New Republic carried three authoritative analyses of child-centered education and its alleged failure to provide for optimal intellectual development. By the time these articles appeared the stock market crash

had taken place, the depression was beginning to settle over the country, and the socially-oriented reformist educators were starting to re-assert themselves more vigorously. Boyd Bode of Ohio State University wrote the first article in a New Republic series on "The New Education Ten Years After." His contribution was an incisive critique of both "the doctrine of specific objectives" and "the doctrine of 'freedom." By the former he meant the pseudoscientific, utilitarian pedagogy identified with Franklin Bobbitt and W. W. Charters. Bode noted the absence of any reformist element in this "scheme," which was "naturally predicated on the requirements of society as now constituted. . ." He concluded: "A more poverty-stricken conception of education than this it would be difficult to imagine."

Bode was less hostile to "the freedom theory of education," but noted that its claims to true Deweyan lineage were not clear. This theory,

> though always facile in quoting Dewey to its purpose, seems never to have acquired an understanding of Dewey's conception of freedom . . . According to Dewey, freedom is achieved through the exercise of intelligence, whereas the less discriminating of his disciples understand him to mean that intelligence is achieved through the exercise of freedom.23

Freedom, then, was not something to be found when adult stimuli and coercion were removed; it was to be created through the growth of a disciplined intelligence.[24] And for the development of such intelligence "a body of scientifically-organized matter is of inestimable value, not only as a resource in later life, but as a basis for present thinking . . . The lack of concern for the scientific organization of subject matter that is shown by the newer movements in education is an ominous fact. It tends to justify the suspicion that they seek to achieve the ends of education by a kind of magic."

It is clear that Bode had not been seduced by the beguiling rhetoric of the

new Rousseauans. Their pedagogy was lacking in reformist vigor, had "no adequate mission or social gospel," and failed to give sufficient emphasis to "the place of intelligence in human affairs . . ."[25]

The second article in this series, by Joseph K. Hart, provided another profound critique of the excesses of the child-centered movement. Hart's concern centered on two related problems - the lack of personal integration achieved by many progressive school graduates and their inability to relate effectively to others and to society in general. Like Bode, he saw an excess of purposeless freedom and a shortage of intelligent direction: "It seems certain that the progressive schools have been successful in their emotional rebellions against the 'stupidities' of the academic schools, but not so successful in the intellectual task of establishing these freer methods as a positive instrument of personal education in a social world."[26]

The final article in the series was a vigorous, authoritative examination by John Dewey of the question "How Much Freedom in the New Schools?"[27] Dewey posited a Hegelian swing from the "thesis" stage of traditional formalistic education to its "antithesis" in the child-centered schools, which had produced a "one-sided emphasis - that upon pupils at the expense of subject matter." He was not satisfied with the shift from the old formalism to the new chaos, and held that the solution was not to discard or to de-emphasize content, but to develop "a new subject matter, as well organized as the old . . . but having an intimate and developing relation to the experience of those in school."

Like Bode, Dewey believed that a new curriculum, well-taught, could enhance children's freedom by preparing them to mold their environments and to direct their own lives. The way for the new schools to increase their effectiveness was to develop "the rational freedom which is the fruit of objective knowledge

and understanding." Dewey thus outlined the task of the child-centered school - to go beyond the existing stage of "casual improvisation and living intellectually from hand to mouth." The schools would have to develop experimentally a subject matter which would include "preparation for the social realities - including the evils - of industrial civilization."

As Dewey's writings consistently attest, intelligence and knowledge were instruments, not ends in themselves. Intelligence had evolved in order to help humans cope more effectively with their environments.[28] Thus Dewey stressed not only the need for new knowledge and intelligent people able to use that knowledge, but the social ends to which it should be put. He wrote:

> A truly progressive development of progressive education could not be secured by the study of children alone. It requires a searching study of society and its moving forces. That the traditional schools have almost evaded consideration of the social potentialities of education is no reason why progressive schools should continue the evasion, even though it be sugared over with esthetic refinements. The time ought to come when no one will be judged to be an educated man or woman who does not have insight into the basic forces of industrial civilization.

This analysis led Dewey to define out of the progressive education movement those institutions which ignored the pressing need for sound social knowledge: "Only schools which take the lead in bringing about this kind of education can claim to be progressive in any socially significant sense."[29]

What one finds in Dewey's argument, then, is not a defense of neutral intellectuality or disinterested scholarship. Rather, one sees the committed reformer aghast at the social waste involved in producing esthetes, dabblers and triflers. Society desperately needed people with deep social insights and skills if human problems were to be solved, and Dewey firmly believed that the schools must produce such people. Thus we see in Dewey's writings (as in Bode's)

the twin values of reformism and intellectualism tied inextricably together.

It is clear, then, that Dewey, Bode, Hart, and other writers for the liberal journals vigorously defended an intellectual, reformist role for the new education. But what of the journal editors themselves? A brief summary - through the "reader's-eye-view" - will provide background for the editors' positions on this issue. During the 1920's, the readers of either major journal (but especially the New Republic) were kept well informed on developments in progressive education - including some of the disputes within the movement. New Republic readers, if they followed the articles and reviews by Elizabeth Irwin and Margaret Naumberg, may also have noted the anti-intellectual and non-reformist elements in their educational programs. But they may also have been impressed by the authoritative and more philosophically rigorous defenses of intellectualism and reformism which issued from the pens of J.K. Hart, Boyd Bode, and John Dewey.

Dewey was, from 1922 to 1937, a contributing editor of the New Republic - evidence that he was considered by the regular editors as closely aligned with the general policies of the journal.[30] The material above is at least a partial indication that Dewey was himself free of the taint of anti-intellectualism. But what of Croly and the other regular editors? Do their editorials cited earlier bespeak a fundamental anti-intellectual bent? An examination of the context of editorial statements shows that a rather complex answer is required.

In the instances noted above, the editors' snide comments on intellectual studies can be read more properly as defenses of the expanding role of the high schools and as critiques of a narrow academic curriculum. In each case, the editorial was in part a response to statements by President Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation. Pritchett was appalled by the growing masses of young

people being retained in American high schools and by the immense expense which this entailed for the nation.[31] He felt that many of these young people should not be in high school, since some were ill-prepared to profit from traditional academic studies and had forced the schools to lower standards and to expand the curriculum to include vocational training and other watered-down fare. His solution was to return to educational fundamentals and to let non-academic pupils drop out entirely or enter special trade schools.[32]

In the editors' minds, Pritchett had raised what was basically a social class issue. They saw the consequence of Pritchett's proposals as a restriction of the high school to the more prosperous classes and a dumping of lower-class children either onto the labor market or into vocational schools which would serve to freeze existing class lines:

> The notion that schooling should end for all but the ablest and most fortunate at twelve or fourteen years of age is a monstrous survival of everything that we as Americans are committed to getting away from. It represents an abdication of social intelligence and nurture; a surrender of society to blind chance with the odds all on the side of those favored by fortune. 33

Like Dewey, the editors saw the sources of educational problems as lying beyond the school: "A transitional and often incoherent society has reflected itself in a transitional and often incoherent education." And they agreed with Dewey that the way out was neither to return to the old subject matter nor to abandon content altogether. The solution was to discover new fundamentals in education appropriate "to the needs of those who attend." Educational and social imperatives called for "faith in humanity and faith in inquiry and continued experimentation. Social snobbishness, fear for the pocket of the tax-payer and complacent assurance that fundamentals are already known renders a disservice."[34]

The consistency of the editors' conviction on this point is attested to by the fact that their editorial, "The High School and Democracy," which accompanied the New Republic supplement on the high school eight months later, was essentially a reprise of this earlier statement. The editors cited some of the same remarks of Pritchett's and rebutted them with several of the same points. And this time they had George Counts' evidence on class discrimination in high schools with which to undergird their opinions.[35]

The editors were, however, perceptive enough to note that teachers and administrators, who had to work amidst the pressures of the new mass high school, were often inclined to sympathize with views like those of Pritchett's. They were the ones who suffered when the high school became a "kindergarten for adolescents" and who wondered "how long the experiment of democracy must continue to involve individual and social waste and inefficiency."[36] The way out, however, was not to choose between educational democracy and educational excellence, but to keep the young in school, help them to choose appropriate educational paths, and then to insure that "the years of choice shall be followed by years of more strenuous application of standards of workmanship, whether in intellectual or technical efforts."

Like so many New Republic and Nation editorials on education, this one ended on a reformist note. The editors insisted that "the chief derelictions of the high school are due to the false standards of the community." Society maintained a social and economic class structure which impelled parents and children to use the schools as ladders of individual mobility. But the real solution was to create a true industrial democracy in which class lines and privileges would be wiped out - and the "high school should itself be a powerful engine in bringing industrial society to this equilibrium . . ."[37]

When the editors did seem to veer close to the abyss of anti-intellectualism, they were in fact engaging in anti-formalism, anti-academicism, and anti-conservatism. They fought efforts to restore the high school as a class-bound academic hothouse; but were no more favorable to permitting it to remain as a "kindergarten for adolescents." As with men like Bode and Dewey, their defenses of democracy and of social intelligence formed a seamless whole.

Richard Gilman's New Republic review of Anti-intellectualism says that Hofstadter's section on education has "about it too much of the smell of the archives, from which nothing new or revalatory comes."[38] This survey of material from a decade of liberal journals may carry a different archival aroma emanating from the dusty, crumbly, library volumes of The Nation and The New Republic. But is it revalatory? Perhaps it only redresses the balance somewhat. It suggests that Dewey as journalist is a needed source as we try to assess his essential ideas and impact. As a member of its editorial board, and as a writer for The New Republic, Dewey reached thousands of educationally-oriented readers. And he made a valiant effort to correct - as they appeared - misinterpretations and misapplications of his theories. With the help of good editors on The New Republic, he made his points clearly and crisply. Bruce Bliven, whom Herbert Croly hired in 1923 as managing editor of The New Republic, has said that Dewey wrote in "clumsy English," knew that he needed good editors, and never complained about the drastic editing that his articles often required.[39]

Gilman notes that Hofstadter "attempts to rescue Dewey from his more egregious misinterpreters while fixing a certain degree of blame upon him . . ."[40] But if blame must be assigned, this review of the liberal journals may help to shift a measure of it away from Dewey and onto those child-centered educators who were moving from Deweyan reformism to Freudian and Jungian child-centered education.

Hofstadter not only misjudged the effect of Dewey's work; he also, as Merle Borrowman pointed out in a perceptive review, gave "too much credit to the older system of secondary schools and colleges."[41] These institutions were not the centers of intellectual ferment that one might imagine from Hofstadter's description of the slide into progressivism. Hofstadter was to some degree guilty of the two charges which Michael B. Katz has recently leveled at Diane Ravitch. Katz says that Ravitch promoted the "notion that the goals of American schools once were primarily cognitive rather than social, affective, or, in nineteenth-century terminology, moral." And he reports Ravitch's "odd assertion that the schools really did adopt the progressive agenda in the years after the Second World War."[42] There is increasing evidence that progressive education, particularly the Deweyan reformist variety, had only a limited impact on American schools either before or after World War Two. As early as 1956 Merle Curti wrote:

> The contention that Dewey's followers have subtracted intellectual values from our schools fails to take into account certain relevant facts. It assumes that progressive education has actually swept the country, which is hardly the case. And even what passes for progressive education is often the outer shell rather than the substance of Dewey's philosophy. Critics often fail to see that Dewey did not reject reason: he tried to sharpen rationality by urging that assumptions be tested and verified, and that experience be relived and critically reconstructed in terms of new situations.43

Support for Curti's assertion concerning the minimal impact of progressive education may be found in books and articles by Arthur Zilversmit, David Tyack, Larry Cuban, and other scholars.[44] But we need not go as far as Michael Katz, who has written that "Progressivism did not fail to work a fundamental transformation in American schools; it did not even try.[45] The evidence from the liberal journals suggests that Dewey and his more sophisticated interpreters

had a clear picture of the intellectual deficiencies of traditional education as well as a firm reformist stance against anti-intellectual dilutions of the new education and that, in fact, they tried very hard through their multiple roles as educators, journalists, and political activists to make a fundamental and progressive transformation of the traditional school.

It is appropriate to conclude with the words of Dewey's most faithful modern interpreter, Richard Bernstein. In his 1985 John Dewey lecture, Bernstein reminded his listeners: "Nothing would be more unpragmatic - a violation of the pragmatic spirit of Dewey - than the suggestion that a return to his texts is sufficient to gain illumination and guidance for confronting our problems and conflicts."[46] It is not sufficient, but it is clearly helpful. For it is from a careful reading of those texts that Bernstein was able to write, in 1966, the following judicious statement:

> It has become fashionable to criticize American education for being unduly influenced during the last fifty years by Dewey's ideas. But it would be more accurate to say that insofar as our schools have failed to develop the tough-minded habits of intelligence, they have failed to be influenced by what is most basic in Dewey's concept of the function of education in a democratic society.47

NOTES

1. Stephen J. Whitfield, "The Eggheads and the Fatheads," Change, 10 (April, 1978), 64.
2. Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York, 1963), 7.
3. Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism, 6, 359-361.
4. Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York, 1961), 210.
5. Sol Cohen, Progressives and Urban School Reform (New York, 1964), 217, 220; for Cohen's more recent thinking on these issues in the context of intellectual history, see "The School and Personality Development: Intellectual History," in Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda, John Hardin Best, editor (Washington, 1983), 109-137; also "The Mental Hygiene Movement, The Development of Personality and the School: The Medicalization of American Education," History of Education Quarterly, 23 (Summer, 1983), 123-149.
6. Diane Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980 (New York, 1983), 79, 44.
7. Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism, 377, 380n, 389; see also 22n.
8. Max Rafferty, What They Are Doing to Your Children (New York 1964), 16, 18; Hyman G. Rickover, Education and Freedom (New York 1959), 136-40, 145, 153. Rickover's treatment of Dewey, while exceedingly critical, was more temperate than Rafferty's.

1

9. Christopher Lasch, The New Radicalism in America, 1889-1963: The Intellectual as a Social Type (New York, 1965). See especially chapter 9, "The Anti-Intellectualism of the Intellectuals." See also Merle Curti on "the reasoned revolt against reason." American Paradox: The Conflict of Thought and Action (New Brunswick, 1956), 64. For a more recent discussion of this issue in relationship to Herbert Croly, see Herbert Croly of the New Republic by David Levy (Princeton, 1985), 170 and chapter 9.
10. Richard Clark Sterne, "The Nation and Its Century," The Nation, 100th Anniversary Issue, 201 (September 20, 1965), 290.
11. On Croly's change of emphasis from politics to culture, see Levy, Herbert Croly, chapter 9.
12. Elizabeth Irwin, "Personal Education," The New Republic, 40 (November 12, 1924), Part II, 8.
13. Agnes de Lima, "A Public School Experiment," The New Republic, 38 (April 9, 1924), 175.
14. de Lima, "Education Moves Ahead," (Review of seven books on education), The New Republic, 40 (November 12, 1924), Part II, 24.
15. Elizabeth Irwin, "The Youngest Intellectuals," The New Republic, 48 (November 10, 1926), 339-41. Note Miss Irwin's appeal to nature for authority here - a common habit of anti-formalists from Rousseau to the child-centered educators. Cohen cites Irwin's Little Red Schoolhouse as "the embodiment of philanthropy and social work, non-education by traditional definition . ." Progressives, 217.
16. Editorial, "Fundamentals in Education," The New Republic, 34 (March 14, 1923), 58; Editorial, "The High School and Democracy," The New Republic, 36 (November 7, 1923), 269. The latter editorial accompanied the supplement on "The American High School."

17. Irwin, "Personal Education," The New Republic, 40 (November 12, 1924), 8, 9.

18. de Lima, "Education Moves Ahead," The New Republic, 40 (November 12, 1924), 23. This is consistent with Mrs. de Lima's retrospective evaluation of child-centered education. In an interview with the author, she vigorously rejected the blanket assessment of child-centered education as anti-intellectual. In most child-centered schools, she noted, children were surrounded by good books and did excellent academic work. A few institutions like the Walden School did become too Freudian, and some schools let the children run wild. But even in these schools the children learned more than in conventional schools. (Interview, November 18, 1965).

19. Irwin, "The Youngest Intellectuals," The New Republic, 48 (November 10, 1926), 341; Lawrence Morris, "Intelligence as a Physiological Process," The New Republic, 51 (July 27, 1927), 261; de Lima, "The New Education," The Nation, 118 (May 18, 1924), 702; Evelyn Dewey, "The New Education," The Nation, 112 (May 11, 1921), 685.

20. In labeling the child-centered educators as "sentimentalists," Cremin quoted Chesterton's definition of the sentimentalist as the "man who wants to eat his cake and have it . . . he will not see that one must pay for an idea as for anything else." Transformation, 376-7.

21. Alvin Johnson, "The Walden School," The New Republic, 34 (March 28, 1923), 135. Joseph K. Hart declared that the continual assertions that the child-centered schools could have the best of both worlds were "rationalizations, wishful thinking, defenses of inertia." "Judging Our Progressive Schools," The New Republic, 63 (June 11, 1930), 96.

22. Jean Temple, "The Modern School and Our Present Culture," The New Republic, 57 (January 2, 1929), 199. Temple quoted the authors' opinion that some of the schools were producing "dabblers, triflers, witty surface-scrapers of life. Out of such cannot come the moving force to live life and remake it in the living."

23. Bode, "Apprenticeship or Freedom," The New Republic, 63 (June 4, 1930), 62. Hofstadter's earliest citation of Bode is from his 1938 book Progressive Education at the Crossroads. Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism, 373n and 386-7. See also Dewey's article on "Science, Belief, and the Public," in which he stated that "freedom of mind is not something that spontaneously happens. It is not achieved by the mere absence of obvious restraints. It is a product of constant, unremitting nurture of right habits of observation and reflection." The New Republic, 38 (April 2, 1924), 145.

24. Bode here pointed to the danger of what David Riesman later labeled "other-directedness." The Lonely Crowd, (New Haven, 1950), 17-24. Bode noted the "defenselessness of children against external stimuli," and cited William James' comment on an environment which "makes the child seem to belong less to himself than to every object which happens to catch his notice. . ." The New Republic, 63 (June 4, 1930), 63. Dewey reinforced this point in protesting against the substitution of "child-dictation" for "adult-dictation," "How Much Freedom in the New Schools?" The New Republic, 63 (July 9, 1930), 205.

25. Bode, "Apprenticeship or Freedom," 63-4.

26. Joseph K. Hart, "Judging Our Progressive Schools," The New Republic, 63 (June 11, 1930), 95.

27. The quotations which follow are from Dewey's article in The New Republic, 63 (July 9, 1930), 204-6. Francis Froelicher's contribution to the series, "A Program for Progressive Schools," was also critical of child-centered excesses: "'Freedom' is a word too often profaned by modern educators . . . Freedom in academic work must first of all be founded upon thorough, authentic scholarship . ." The New Republic, 63 (June 18, 1939), 123-5. Two of the articles in the series, those by Margaret Naumberg and Caroline Pratt, promoted the child-centered position.

28. See, for example, Democracy and Education (New York, 1961; first published in 1916), 337-8.

29. Dewey, "How Much Freedom in the New Schools?" 206. This is one point at which reference to Dewey's journalistic writings might have prevented some of Hofstadter's imbalanced treatment of Dewey. On this issue, Hofstadter quotes Dewey's optimistic My Pedagogic Creed (1897) and misses more tough-minded and critical statements from his articles for the liberal journals. See Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism, 387.

30. See Jo Ann Boydston, "John Dewey and the Journals," History of Education Quarterly, 10 (Spring, 1970), 72-77. Boydston reports that Dewey wrote 179 articles for The New Republic, far more than for any other journal, and that he wrote nine articles for The Nation.

31. Editorial, "The High School and Democracy," The New Republic, 36 (November 7, 1923), 268.

32. Pritchett's views were presneted in the 17th Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (New York, 1922). The quotation cited is from page 101.

33. Editorial, "Fundamentals in Education," The New Republic, 34 (March 14, 1923), 58. Cremin points out that The New Republic carried editorials favorable to the limitation of college enrollments. (Transformation, 189) But the motivation here was similarly class-conscious: the editors believed that existing colleges were often "social clubs for the aristocracy." The New Republic 32 (October 4, 1922), 137-8.
34. The New Republic, 34 (March 14, 1923), 53-9.
35. The New Republic, 36 (November 7, 1923), 269-70; Counts, "The Social Composition of the High School," The New Republic, 36 (November 7, 1923), Part II, 5-7. On the context for Counts' article, see Gerald Gutek, The Educational Theory of George S. Counts (Columbus, 1970), chapter II.
36. These teachers were experiencing the shift described by Martin Trow from an "elite preparatory" to a "mass terminal" educational system. Cited in Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism, 357.
37. "The High School and Democracy," The New Republic, 36 (November 7, 1923), 269-70. The editorial, presumably by Croly - an avid Anglophile - cited the lesson "preached and illustrated by Sanderson of Oundle" on this last point. The New Republic had recently carried a series of articles by H.G. Wells on Sanderson's work. (Volume 36, 147-7, 172-4, 199-201, 226-8, 278-80, 324-7).
38. Richard Gilman, "The Intellect and Its Enemies," The New Republic, 149 (July 13, 1963), 19-22.
39. Interview with Bruce Bliven by the author, August 28, 1965. On this point see Bliven's autobiography, Five Million Words Later (New York, 1970) 173; also George Dykhuizen, The Life and Mind of John Dewey, Carbondale, 1973), 180.

40. Gilman, "The Intellect and Its Enemies," 21.

41. Merle Borrowman, Review of Anti-intellectualism in American Life, History of Education Quarterly, 3, (December, 1963), 223-225.

42. Michael B. Katz, "Not the Whole Story," (Review of The Troubled Crusade, by Diane Ravitch, History of Education Quarterly, 25 (Spring-Summer, 1985), 175-176. An early statement of the first idea in Katz's critique may be found in C.E. Ayres' review of Joseph K. Hart's The Discovery of Intelligence. Ayres accepted Hart's view that "the function of education is to cultivate the intellect," but added that Hart tended to overrate the intellectuality of past eras and to underrate the degree of modern intellectual liberation. The New Republic, 40 (November 19, 1924), 300.

43. Curti, American Paradox, 63.

44. Arthur Zilversmit, "The Failure of Progressive Education, 1920-1940," in Lawrence Stone, editor, Schooling and Society: Studies in the History of Education (Baltimore, 1976), 252-263; David Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge: 1974), 193-198; Larry Cuban, How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980 (New York 1984).

45. Michael Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and Schools (New York, 1971), 125.

46. Richard J. Bernstein, "Varieties of Pluralism," Current Issues in Education, 5 (Fall, 1985), 17.

47. Richard J. Bernstein, John Dewey (New York, 1966), 144-5.